DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 414 JC 730 198

TITLE	Evaluation of Administrators [and] Practices for Evaluating Administrators, Guidelines and Procedures for Evaluation of Regular (Tenured) Administrators.
INSTITUTION	Napa Coll., Calif.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	9p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Evaluation; *College Administration; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Techniques; Guides; Higher Education; Post Secondary Education; *Rating Scales

ABSTRACT

Procedures for evaluating college administrators are provided. The first evaluation relates to the administrator's skill in bringing about optimum development, progress, and attainment of students. Standard forms for the evaluation of the college president, associate dean of instruction, and assistant dean of student activities are then discussed, followed by a description of a proposed design for evaluating administrators by use of standard evaluation instruments. Practices for evaluating administrators are then presented as to purpose, procedures, and standards. The last section of the paper presents guidelines and procedures for evaluation of regular (tenured) administrators. These guidelines cover the formation of evaluating team and principles of procedure, mode of evaluation (by steps), bases for evaluation, and form and disposal of evaluative findings. (DB)

ED 081414

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

N A P A C O L L E G E

September 26, 1972

EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

I. Assumptions*

All educational programs exist in a context that is larger than their own specific boundaries; they all interact with one another in some fashion. The development, progress and attainment of students is influenced by a variety of conditions and events, including this interaction.

II. Goal

One of the responsibilities of administrators is to be aware of this context and these conditions and events and to use their skills and the resources of the institution to bring about optimum development, progress and attainment of students.

III. Evaluation of Effectiveness of Selected Administrators in Achieving This Goal

Items 2 and 3 under Bases for Evaluation, "Guidelines and Procedures for Evaluation of Regular Administrators" may best be achieved by use of a standard form administered to all populations. This form should provide respondents with an opportunity to react to various aspects of the college environment. An evaluation of these responses from all populations should provide a common assessment of the effectiveness of administrators in achieving the goal described above. This form of evaluation should minimize the effect of personal acquaintance or the lack of it on the part of respondents with any administrator or with his specific areas of responsibilities. It

JC 730 198

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

would provide the administrator with an assessment of his effect on the total college environment.

IV. Proposed Standard Forms for the Evaluation of the College President, Associate Dean of Instruction and Assistant Dean of Student Activities

College and University Environment Scales (CUES) *

1. This instrument in its abbreviated form is comprised of 20 items which reflect the range of five scales used in the long form of CUES. These scales are:

   a. Practicality - an environment characterized by enterprise, organization, material benefits, and social activities; vocational and collegiate emphases; orderly supervision.

   b. Community - a friendly, cohesive, group-oriented campus.

   c. Awareness - campus encourages concern about social and political problems, expressiveness through the arts, tolerance of criticism.

   d. Propriety - an atmosphere that is mannerly, considerate, proper, and conventional.

   e. Scholarship - an environment characterized by intellectuality and scholastic discipline, intellectual achievement, and the pursuit of knowledge.

This form or a selection or combination of other forms may be chosen by the President and the team.

This instrument could be administered to all trustees, all counselors, a random sample of faculty and students, day and extended day. This will provide a base for assessing the college environment which is equally valid for respondents regardless of their acquaintance with the administrator.

The abbreviated version of CUES seems appropriate for evaluation of the College President.

2. Another form of CUES assesses the quality of teaching and faculty-student relations. Items involved are:

a. The professor is
a dedicated scholar,
a thorough teacher,
and sets high standards of achievement.

b. In his courses he
keeps his materials up-to-date,
clearly explains the goals and purposes,
and stimulates good discussions.

c. In his relations with students, he is
helpful,
friendly,
and interested in them as individuals.

This or other forms chosen by the Associate Dean of Instruction and the team may be used.

3. The "Campus Morale," "Involvement in Campus Events" or "Involvement in Campus Reforms" sections of CUES or some combination could be chosen by the Assistant Dean of Student Activities for his evaluation.

V. Proposed Design for Evaluating Administrators by Use of Standard Evaluation Instruments

1. The evaluating team and administrator involved consider selection of instrument to be used for Items 2 and 3 for steps 3 and 5.

2. The size and nature of the sample populations shall be determined by the team and the administrator.

3. The administration of the instruments and analysis of data shall be the responsibility of the chairman of the evaluating team.

4. The findings for each administrator shall be used as the comparison with his self-assessment for Item 4.

5. The analysis of the assessment for each administrator shall be done in accord with the Suggested Guidelines, Item 5.

6. The report embodying the findings shall include the design for the evaluation and the rationale supporting it.

*Higher Education Measurement and Evaluation Kit. Field Edition 1972 C.R. Pace Center for the Study of Evaluation UCLA Graduate School of Education Los Angeles, Ca. Part II

NAPA COLLEGE

PRACTICES FOR EVALUATING ADMINISTRATORS — April 1973

A. Purpose

It is the purpose of the evaluation of administrators in positions requiring the possession of an Administrative Credential to increase their leadership ability and productivity to the end that educational opportunities for students are enhanced.

B. Procedures

1. Each administrator, except as provided by Education Code Section 13480.15, shall be evaluated bi-annually.

2. Using the following minimum procedure, during the period April 1 to August 1, each administrator will meet individually with his or her immediate subordinates in a conference in which they shall agree upon performance standards for the subordinate's position as described, specific tasks and goals to be met in the ensuing academic year and establish priorities. Each Administrator to be evaluated shall prepare an outline of his projected standards, tasks, goals and priorities in advance of the meeting.

3. On or before February 1, each administrator shall submit to his immediate superior a written statement assessing his or her own performance for the preceding year based upon the agreed upon expectations. This statement may include statements and information from students, faculty and other administrators. This statement and the observations by the superior shall be the subject of a conference between the two to be held prior to February 20.

4. During the conference, the ranking administrator shall furnish his or her subordinate a copy of his or her written evaluation, which shall also be sent along with the self-evaluation to the appropriate Dean who shall forward the documents to the President and then to the personnel file. Both parties to the evaluation shall sign the evaluation. When major concerns are expressed, the administrator shall suggest a course of improvement and provide for follow-up.

C. Standards

1. The performance of assigned duties and responsibilities as prescribed in the position description as a measure of quality, productivity and initiative.

2. The quality of interpersonal relations with students, faculty, the public, colleagues, staff and those whom he or she supervises.

3. The prompt resolution of conflicts and grievances satisfactorily and the initiation of actions to reduce recurrence.

4. Ability to make decisions which are broadly accepted and in a manner such that their execution may be expected.

5. The talent and techniques for selecting highly qualified personnel as demonstrated by the quality of the performance of those employed.

6. Consistently accurate, useful evaluation of personnel.

7. Short- and long-range planning and adequacy and accuracy of estimates.

8. The initiation of study and the evaluation of policies and procedures in his area of responsibility.

9. The extent and quality of contribution of ideas and constructive criticism to projects, proposals and other ideas.

10. The quality of written and oral communication, including accuracy, adequacy, timeliness and frequency of reports.

11. Budget preparation and execution and particular reference to cost control and maximization of productivity.

12. Familiarity with statutes and case law relating to education.

13. The ability and willingness to accept special assignments from time to time even though the tasks may be unrelated to his or her assignment.

NAPA COLLEGE

GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF REGULAR (TENURED) ADMINISTRATORS

I Formation of Evaluating Team and Principles of Procedure

1. The purpose of evaluation is to maintain and improve the effectiveness of administration.

2. There shall be an evaluating team of three credentialed members: two from the Faculty Senate and one from the administrative staff. The team members shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees (consulting with the Administration on the one administrative member) and approved by the Faculty Senate.

II Mode of Evaluation (by steps)

Step 1. In each year the evaluating team shall choose for evaluation approximately half the regular (tenured) members of the Administration, so that every member may be evaluated once every two years. The names of those selected will be forwarded at, or immediately after, the pre-quarterly fall meeting to the members concerned and to the college President.

Step 2. About the fourth week of the fall quarter, the evaluating team will explain the procedures of evaluation to the selected members of the Administration and will note the reasonable individual preferences of the members in regard to the parts of the procedure to be accentuated.

Step 3. The first meetings of the evaluating team with individuals to be evaluated will take place from the fifth or sixth week of the fall quarter and will be completed by the end of that quarter.

Step 4. The winter quarter will be a time for the administrators being evaluated to try out any changes which they propose to make or which are suggested to them by the evaluating team for the enhancement of their work as administrators.

Step 5. The second meeting of the evaluating team with administrators being evaluated will take place in the third or fourth week of the spring quarter (i.e., as early as may be in the spring quarter).

III Bases for Evaluation

In the meetings mentioned in Steps 3 and 5 above, the bases for evaluation will be alike and will include the following items and guidelines, the items mentioned to be presented to the chairman of the Evaluating Committee.

Item 1. Self-evaluation: that is the judgment of the administrator on his own effectiveness in relation to the proper aims and outcomes of his actions compared with his responsibilities.

Item 2. Written evaluation by students: that is, the free comments on administration succinctly made by students.

Item 3. Evaluation by instructors, counselors, trustees, and others.

Item 4. Evaluation by fellow administrators: that is, evaluation of the administrator's self-assessment by comparison with information supplied by instructors, students, counselors, and trustees.

Item 5. Suggested Guidelines

1. Does this administrator keep the teaching/learning function of the institution uppermost in plans and action?

2. Does this administrator operate at the convenience of students and faculty?

3. Does this administrator inspire confidence?

4. Does this administrator create an atmosphere in which work of the college can proceed smoothly?

5. The Evaluation Committee in evaluating the performance of regular (tenured) administrators shall select from, as appropriate to the individual administrator, the following guidelines. The committee and the administrator may add guidelines as appropriate. Does, for instance, the administrator

   a. have the ability and willingness to "open doors" for faculty members
   b. attend to details effectively?
   c. instill enthusiasm for professional goals?
   d. judge people perceptively and fairly?
   e. keep abreast of new developments and innovations in higher education?
   f. make sound decisions?
   g. plan effectively and imaginatively?
   h. resolve or ameliorate human conflicts?
   i. say "no" effectively?
   j. understand and use modern management procedures?
   k. have the willingness to appraise situations and problems impartially?
   l. have the willingness to put others first?
   m. work effectively with faculty members?
   n. work effectively with other administrators?

IV Form and Disposal of Evaluative Findings

1. The findings shall be embodied in one report completed before the end of the spring quarter. The report shall indicate whether the administrator is satisfactory or unsatisfactory in the performance of his duties and shall be forwarded to the College President.

2. If the administrator is found in some measure unsatisfactory, these comments shall go to him during the fall quarter. If indicated during evaluation, institutional modifications shall be recommended as part of the report to the college President.

3. The college President will, upon request, review the evaluation of an administrator.

4. Findings to be reviewed with the Board of Trustees twice yearly.

V Other Considerations

The Committee will consider relevant suggestions being developed elsewhere during the two-year experience of evaluation under these procedures and guidelines.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 28 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

6/23/72